



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,786	02/28/2002	Russell B. Stuber	L13.12-0174/01-262	8978

7590 06/29/2006
Sandeep Jaggi
LSI LOGIC CORPORATION
M/S D-106
1551 McCarthy Boulevard
Milpitas, CA 95035

EXAMINER

KING, JUSTIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2111

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/086,786

Applicant(s)

STUBER ET AL.

Examiner

Justin I. King

Art Unit

2111

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: None.
Claim(s) objected to: 5 and 8.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 6 and 7.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 9-16.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


MARK H. RINEHART
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 3. and 11. NOTE:

Applicant has amended claims to include new limitation of "next highest in the return command register", which has not been searched and considered on the record.

Applicant argues that the prior arts on record do not disclose staging register: Marisetty disclose a prediction technique to further enhance the conventional split transaction. Marisetty discloses an early bus request logic and bus grant prediction/arbitration logic to further reduce bus latency along with the conventional FIFO buffer. Marisetty's early bus prediction mechanism is equivalent to the claimed staging register and control device, which stores the identification of the master device and to release the split of the master device.

Applicant argues that the prior arts on record do not disclose the control device as claimed: As stated in the previous Office Action and acknowledged by the Applicant, the means to release the split master is equivalent to the claimed control device. The claims are rejected based on the combination of the admitted prior art and Marisetty. Marisetty discloses prioritizing based on first-in-first-out order (FIFO buffer). Marisetty teaches one the early prediction technique to further enhance the bus performance. The claimed split of the next master device will be the next command in the FIFO. Applicant argues that Marisetty does not disclose the control device. Marisetty discloses that the split transaction is well known in the computer art. The inherent means to manage the split transaction is equivalent to the control device. Marisetty also discloses an early bus request logic and bus grant prediction/arbitration logic to further reduce bus latency along with the conventional FIFO buffer. Marisetty's early bus prediction mechanism is equivalent to the claimed staging register and control device.

Applicant argues that neither reference discloses a control that releases the master device that is next highest in a return command register: Examiner believes that Applicant may have meant release the split of the master device